UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,871	07/07/2003	Koichi Otsuki	Q76468	6980

23373 7590 11/08/2007

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
VO, QUANG N	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/612,871	OTSUKI, KOICHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quang N. Vo	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 October 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *14-16* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-13 in the reply filed on 10/9/2007 is acknowledged. Claims 14-16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species I and III, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 9/10/2007.

Response to Amendment

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adelmann (US 6,644,556) in view of Toyoshima (US 2002/0082048).

With regard to claim 1, Adelmann discloses a memory card (e.g., storage device, figure 2) that is provided independent of a printing apparatus having a processor (e.g., controller (block 200), figure 2, column 3, lines 9-21), wherein information is to be read with a reader of said printing apparatus (e.g., host

electrical devices, 14-18); and information for allowing visual confirmation of a change in an image that is caused by said processing (e.g., data can comprise text and/or images; the indicator conveys accurate, up to date information of memory available, column 4, lines 34-47).

Adelmann differs from claim 1, in that he does not explicitly teach performs predetermined processing with respect to image data based on information read from said memory card said memory card comprising: process information for performing said predetermined processing.

Toyoshima discloses performs predetermined processing with respect to image data based on information read from said memory card said memory card comprising: process information for performing said predetermined processing (e.g., a modulation/demodulation unit processing and converting data, paragraph 0029).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann to include performs predetermined processing with respect to image data based on information read from said memory card said memory card comprising: process information for performing said predetermined processing as taught by Toyoshima. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann by the teaching of Toyoshima to conveniently process image data in memory storage and save processing time in other device.

With regard to claim 2, Adelmann discloses wherein said information for allowing visual confirmation is shown on a surface of said memory card (column 2, lines 25-65, figure 1).

With regard to claim 11, Adelmann differs from claim 11, in that he does not explicitly teach wherein said storage medium is capable of communicating wirelessly with said printing apparatus.

Toyoshima discloses storage medium is capable of communicating wirelessly with said printing apparatus (paragraphs 0004, 0009).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann to include storage medium is capable of communicating wirelessly with said printing apparatus as taught by Toyoshima. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann by the teaching of Toyoshima to conveniently transmit data wirelessly.

With regard to claim12, Adelmann differs from claim 12, in that he does not explicitly teach further comprising a flat antenna.

Toyoshima discloses further comprising a flat antenna (paragraph 0026).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann to include a flat antenna as taught by Toyoshima. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann by the teaching of Toyoshima to transmit data wirelessly.

With regard to claim 13, Adelmann discloses further comprising a contact point for connecting to said printing apparatus (e.g., a connector 110, column 2, lines 31-39).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adelmann (US 6,644,556) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wolcott et al. (Wolcott) (US 7,158,945).

With regard to claim 3, Adelmann differs from claim 3, in that he does not explicitly teach wherein said process information is information for making a change in a color tone of an image to be printed.

Wolcott discloses process information is information for making a change in a color tone of an image to be printed (e.g., tone correction, column 13, lines 19-31).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann to include process information is information for making a change in a color tone of an image to be printed as taught by Wolcott. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann by the teaching of Wolcott to save different types (formats) of digital image.

With regard to claim 4, Wolcott discloses wherein said change in the color tone is an emphasis of a specific color (e.g., monochrome, sepia, column 14, lines 33-37).

With regard to claim 5, Wolcott discloses wherein said change in the color tone is a color conversion from a color image to a monochrome (e.g., monochrome, column 14, lines 33-37).

With regard to claim 6, Wolcott discloses wherein said change in the color tone is a color conversion from a color image to a sepia image (e.g., sepia, column 14, lines 33-37).

With regard to claim 7, Wolcott discloses wherein said information for making a change in the color tone is a color conversion data table (column 13, lines 39-43).

With regard to claim 8, Adelmann differs from claim 8, in that he does not explicitly teach process information is information for changing a size of an image to be printed.

Wolcott discloses wherein said process information is information for changing a size of an image to be printed (e.g., digital zooming and cropping, column 14, lines 38-43).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann to include process information is information for changing a size of an image to be printed as taught

by Wolcott. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann by the teaching of Wolcott to change a size of an image such that the image suitable for printing.

With regard to claim 9, Adelmann differs from claim 9, in that he does not explicitly teach process information is information for changing a resolution of an image to be printed.

Wolcott discloses wherein said process information is information for changing a resolution of an image to be printed (e.g., cropping, column 14, lines 40-44).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann to include process information is information for changing a resolution of an image to be printed as taught by Wolcott. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann by the teaching of Wolcott to change a resolution of an image such that the image suitable for printing.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adelmann (US 6,644,556) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Shiozaki et al. (Shiozaki) (JP 2001103416).

With regard to claim 10, Adelmann differs from claim 10, in that he does not explicitly teach wherein said information for allowing visual confirmation is an example of an image printed without said processing being performed and an example of an image printed with said processing being performed.

Shiozaki discloses information for allowing visual confirmation is an example of an image printed without said processing being performed and an example of an image printed with said processing being performed (see problem to be solved and solution, Abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann to include information for allowing visual confirmation is an example of an image printed without said processing being performed and an example of an image printed with said processing being performed as taught by Shiozaki. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Adelmann by the teaching of Shiozaki to have visual image changing confirmation.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Vo whose telephone number is 5712701121. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-5:00PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, King Y. Poon can be reached on 5712727440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Quang N. Vo 11/1/07
Patent Examiner

KING Y. POON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER